



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/939,050	09/26/1997	JASON I. GLITHERO	A61-16737-US	3492
128	7590	05/18/2004	EXAMINER	
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			MENGISTU, AMARE	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		25

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/939,050	GLITHERO, JASON I.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Amare Mengistu	2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification as originally filed has failed to teach applicant's now claimed as his invention "***knob corresponds to a user specified alphanumeric value***". The above claimed subject matter was not described in the disclosure does not teach one skilled in the art how to make or use the recited claimed invention at the time of the application was filed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3,5-6,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** (fig.1) in view of **John L. Weston** (GB 2174663A) and **Ramaswamy et al** (5,627,547).

As to claims 1,5, and 8; **Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** (hereinafter AAPA) discloses an input device for an aircraft/vehicle computer system (see, fig. 1, pages 1-2) comprising: a cursor control including, a wrist rest (fig.1 (11A)); a cursor control device (fig.1 (12)) mounted on said forward of said wrist rest portion and within finger reach of said wrist rest, said device generating cursor control signals representative of said device (see, page 6, lines 29-33); a select button (fig.1 (13)) mounted on said console generating a signals indicating of an activation of the select button .

**Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** did not teach a rotary knob mounted on said console. However, the patent of **John L. Weston** (hereinafter Weston) clearly states that it is well known for an aircraft console to have knob (figs.2-5 (22)); a switch (23) and a scroll buttons (24,25) and rotating said knob to selected desired value for said parameter (see, page, 2, col.1, lines 65- col.2, lines 92).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to incorporate a knob into the aircraft console as taught Weston into the device of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, because this is an advantage for the input device of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in order so that the user can rotate the knob easily to a achieve an accurately set value.

**Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** as modified by **Weston** clearly teaches that is well known for an aircraft input device to have a rotary knob, but has failed to teach that

the knob is used to enter an alphanumeric. The patent of **Ramaswamy et al** clearly teaches that it is conventional for a rotary knob used to enter user's selected specific alphanumeric value (fig.2 (16) col.11, lines 19-67, col.12, lines 22-34.). The knob (fig.2 (16)) has to select an alphanumeric in order for the display to display alphanumeric (fig.2 (34)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to the rotary knob of Ramaswamy **et al** into the device of **Applicant's Admitted Prior Art**, because this will allow the user to enter sequence of alphanumeric data to display aircraft / vehicle tracking information and coordinates.

As to claims 2 and 6, it is conventional for a rotary knob to have a coarse-fine knob (see, page 6, line 22-23) as taught by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

As to claim 3, Weston teaches a knob, it is obvious that the rotary knob (22) is extending axially from its housing.

5. Claims 4,7,9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** (fig.1) in view of Weston and Ramaswamy **et al** as applied to claims 1-3,5-10 above, and further in view of **Aerospace Engineering** (December 1994).

As to claims 4,7,9-10; **Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** (hereinafter AAPA) discloses an input device for an aircraft/vehicle computer system (see, fig. 1, pages 1-2) comprising: a cursor control including, a wrist rest (fig.1 (11A)); a cursor control device (fig.1 (12)) are mounted on a input housing within finger reach of said wrist rest, said

device generating cursor control signals representative of said device (see, page 6, lines 29-33); a select button (fig.1 (13)) mounted on said housing generating a signals indicating of an activation of the select button .

**Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** did not teach a rotary knob mounted on said console. However, the patent of **John L. Weston** (hereinafter Weston) clearly states that it is well known for an aircraft console to have knob (figs.2-5 (22)); a switch (23) and a scroll buttons (24,25) and rotating said knob to selected desired value for said parameter (see, page, 2, col.1, lines 65- col.2, lines 92).

**Applicant's Admitted Prior Art** (fig.1) as modified by **Weston** and **Ramaswamy et al** discloses an aircraft input device including a cursor controller, a knob and a switch, but has failed to teach manipulating a cursor control device to select a desired parameter and also the input device having a joystick. **The Aerospace Engineering** article states the cursor to selected the desired parameter (see, page 13, col.2, the last 4 lines – col.3, line 4 (selecting checklist)) and suggests that a joystick can also be used in an aircraft input device (page 13 “Table 1”; col.3, last paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to incorporate the Aerospace Engineering joystick into the input device of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art since this will allow the pilot to maneuver the input device in a limited space with good reliability.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed on March 8,2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that **Ramaswamy et al** does not teach, "User specified alphanumeric value". The Examiner strongly disagrees with Applicant's assertion. First. The specification as originally filed does not provide support for newly recited claim limitation. Second, **Ramaswamy et al** clearly teaches that the user can select specified alphanumeric value by using a knob (see, col.11, lines 19-67, col.12, lines 22-33)

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amare Mengistu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, T-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



Amare Mengistu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2673

A.M

May 14,2004